

**INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES**

2006-2007 COMPLIANCE AND ON-SITE MONITORING REPORT

FOR:

The Learning Station

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS		OBSERVATION		COMPLIANCE	
Tutor Qualifications		Lesson matches original description	Satisfactory	Criminal Background Checks	
Recruiting Materials		Instruction is clear	Unsatisfactory	Health/safety laws & regulations	
Academic Program		Time on task is appropriate	Satisfactory	Financial viability	
Progress Reporting		Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	Satisfactory		
		Student/instructor ratio: 5-2:1	Satisfactory		

ACTION NEEDED: NONE

Provider submitted a corrective action plan that a) described how provider will ensure in the future that tutors are interacting with and engaging students and using lesson plans and instructional methods that are based on addressing each student's individual learning plan (ILP) as described in the application, and b) the process that the Learning Station will use to evaluate the effectiveness of tutors in implementing the program appropriately and accurately, as well as consequences that will be utilized for tutors who are not performing appropriately. This part of the corrective action plan was accompanied by a copy of the Learning Station's tutor evaluation form.

(As per the on-site monitoring rubric instructions, while monitoring/ observation of SES providers is completed annually, document and compliance analysis is completed every two years. Since The Learning Station's document and compliance analysis was completed during the 2005-2006 school year, only an observation was completed for the 2006-2007 school year).

On-site Monitoring Rubric OBSERVATION Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: The Learning Station

SITE: 401 S. Lake Street (Gary, IN)

TUTOR'S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED): variety of tutors

NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED: 5

DATE: 3-28-07

REVIEWER: ST & MC

TIME OF OBSERVATION: 3:25pm

During the site visit, IDOE personnel will visit several tutoring sessions to observe lessons being provided. IDOE reviewers will be looking to see that actual tutoring matches lesson plan descriptions that are provided in requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students are spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction is clear and understandable; and that instructors seem knowledgeable about lesson content.

Each provider will receive a mark of “Satisfactory” (S) or “Unsatisfactory” (U) for each component. Providers receiving a “U” in any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report. Failure to address deficiencies may result in removal from the state approved list.

COMPONENT	S	U	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Lesson matches original description in provider application	X		<p>Provider application states that language arts lessons will focus on word recognition, vocabulary development, phonemic awareness, concept development, comprehension, sentence structure, grammar, etc. and math lessons will focus on problem solving, number sense, computation, algebra, functions, geometry, etc. This was evident in the observed lessons as students worked on language arts lessons on constructing sentences, developing paragraphs, journal writing, and vocabulary fill-in-the-blank worksheets, in addition to math activities and worksheets on rounding after decimals, addition with monetary units (coins), and time patterns. Some students also completed homework with assistance from their tutors.</p> <p>It was not evident that tutors were following lesson plans or that instruction was based on addressing each student's individual learning plan (ILP) as described in the application. Students were grouped based on grade level and typically worked on the same assignments with little individualization or differentiation provided.</p>
Instruction is clear		X	In some cases, students worked independently with no interaction from a tutor. For example, in one classroom where students worked on journals or language arts worksheets, actual instruction on concepts related to the worksheets or journals was not observed (although the tutor did correct the language arts worksheets and give them back to students). This tutor was not observed interacting with any students. In another classroom, one student worked independently on a time pattern worksheet with no interaction from the tutor who spent the entire time (during the observed lesson) working with another student on reading and pronunciation. In addition, this tutor did not appear to correct pronunciation mistakes that were made by the child who was reading. In another room, the tutor working on rounding with students did not appear to always ensure that all students understood the concept (especially those that did not shout out answers or those that shouted out the wrong answers).
Time on task is appropriate	X		Many students were engaged in the lessons observed. However, there were some classrooms

		(particularly in the case with younger students in the back of the building) where students did not complete their work unless the tutor was working directly with them. In addition, there were some classrooms where the noise level either from other nearby classrooms or from other students in the classroom was a distraction.
Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	X	It was not always evident that instructors were following any lesson plans or implementing any of the instructional intervention plans described in the application. In one classroom, the tutor spent a good deal of time writing descriptions of the various types of sentences on a white board but did not provide instruction to students on this concept. This tutor also gave students answers or corrected students' grammatical mistakes (on their paper) rather than providing students with the tools they needed to complete the corrections on their own. Also, in the classroom where students did not interact with their tutor (journal writing) or where the tutor worked individually with only one of her two students, it appeared that these tutors did not employ adequate student engagement techniques. In addition, in most of the lessons, it was not clear how or if each student's individual learning plan directed instruction.
Student/instructor ratio: <u>5-2:1</u>	X	Application notes that the ratio will be 5:1 and that instruction will be in small groups. Observed ratio was 5-2:1 and small groups.